REMARKS

New claim 6 is added herein. Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

Using independent claim 1 as an example, this claim recites the maximum-fuel-injection-quantity restricting means restricting the maximum fuel injection quantity either during or not during the regenerating-mode operation.

The portion of Ludecke et al. relied upon by the Examiner states

> However, when a periodic burn off of particulates in the particulate traps is desired, one of the throttles is closed and the injectors on the associated bank are shut off so that the engine then operates completely with power developed in the other active cylinder bank. The increased load on the four cylinders of the active bank raises the exhaust temperature in this bank a significant amount which may be sufficient to burn off the particulates in the trap located in the exhaust manifold of that cylinder bank.

Ludecke, col. 6, ln. 6-15.

It is particularly noted that "one of throttles is closed" and "the injectors are shut off." These features are distinguishable from the claimed restricting the maximum fuel injection quantity, since the features of Ludecke refer to stopping fuel injection, as opposed to restricting, as claimed.

An advantage of the invention of claim 1 over Ludecke is that it is possible to prevent a DPF system from deteriorating under the effect of increase of the differential pressure between the upstream and downstream of the filter form collecting PM, or prevent exhaust gas pressure and fuel costs from increasing. See present Specification, paragraph [0021].

Furthermore, claim 2 recites fuel restriction indicating means for indicating restriction of the maximum fuel injection quantity of the internal combustion engine when or while the maximum-fuel-injection-quantity restricting means restricts the maximum fuel injection quantity. However, it is respectfully submitted that Ludecke et al. makes no such disclosure and the Examiner has not pointed out a particular portion of Ludecke et al. that discloses this feature.

An advantage of the invention of claim 1 over Ludecke is that it is possible to indicate that the quantity of collected PM in a continuous DPF system exceeds a predetermined value, that the maximum fuel injection quantity is restricted, and that ability to vary the output of an internal combustion engine is restricted. Furthermore, the driver can perform accurate judgment

and driving. See present paragraph [0022].

The remaining references do not overcome these deficiencies. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

New claim 6 is patentable over the cited references at least due to its dependence from independent claim 1.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-3-05

By: _____
Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501